

## REMARKS

Enclosed is a proposed correction in red to Figs. 5, 6, and 7 and replacement drawings including the correction. As noted on page 5, lines 27-36, Figs. 5-7 relate to a conventional liquid crystal display device.

Claims 1-8 and 10 have been amended to place them in more traditional U.S. format, to change definite articles to indefinite articles where appropriate, to correct typographical and grammatical errors, and to avoid improper multiple dependency. No amendments have been made in view of the prior art.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,126,868 to Kizaki et al. (hereafter Kizaki). In the rejection, the Examiner stated that “another at least one display cell (Fig. 1, item 101, 102) sealed by another seal member (Fig. 1, item 110) in which the electro-optical converting member (liquid crystal) is held by two substrates (Col. 6, lines 6-25), and having the defective area and normal area in the inside of the seal member; and these display cells being overlapped; Although Kizaki et al. do not disclose a defective area and a normal area, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that most LCD panels would have a defective area next to the seal member as there would be some interference with the seal member;”.


However, this analysis of Kizaki leaves out the feature of claim 1 “wherein the display cell provided to an opposite side of an observer has a normal area, which is wider than that of the display cell provided to a side of the observer” which is not disclosed or suggested in Kizaki.

In fact, this is the essential feature of the present invention; namely that a normal area where an image is normally displayed is wider in one display cell than in the

other display cell. For example, in Fig. 1 the normal area of the lower display cell is wider than that of the upper display cell.

In contrast, Kizaki in Fig. 1 only discloses that one of the edges of the transparent substrates 111 and 112 of the display cell 101 extends at one of the sides as compared with the edge of the transparent substrates 121 and 122 of the display cell 102. Kizaki fails to disclose, as claimed, that the display area of the display cell 101 is wider than that of the display cell 102 or vice versa..

As shown in Fig. 1 of Kizaki, the width of the display area (between the lines A and B) of the upper cell 102 and the lower cell 101 is the same. On the other hand, according to the present invention, the width of the normal area of the display cell on the observer side is shorter than that of the display cell on the opposite side of the observer. See Fig. 1 of the present application.



that LC cells could be made to be of any size and shape dependent on user requirements."

However, this misses the point. The display cell is not just wider, but specifically the width of the normal area of the display cell on the observer's side is shorter than that of the display cell on the opposite side. The object of the present invention is to solve the problem of the poor display quality due to the defective area of the cell and to provide a liquid crystal display device including an optimum size having an economically useful structure. Accordingly, the size of the cell is not randomly structured but is structured to realize optimum conditions.

Contrary to this, Kizaki fails to disclose the poor display quality due to the defective area and an optimum size having an economically useful structure of a liquid crystal display device. Accordingly, the present invention could not have been easily invented even if a person with ordinary skill in the art knew about the existence of Kizaki at the time when the present invention was made.

Moreover, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under M.P.E.P. §2143, it is necessary that the prior art relied on teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations. Since Kizaki fails to teach or suggest making the normal area of the display cell provided to an opposite side of an observer wider than that of the display cell provided to a side of the observer as set forth in claim 1, it is submitted the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on Kizaki.

Claims 2-8 and 10 are all directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, so it is believed they are not obvious over Kizaki for at least the reasons expressed above.

It is believed claims 1-8 and 10 are in condition for allowance.


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 9, 2004

By:   
Arthur S. Garrett  
Reg. No. 20,338

**Attachments:** **Replacement Sheet(s) - Three (Figs. 5-7).**  
**[Annotated Sheet(s) showing changes - Three (Figs. 5-7)]**

772000\_1